Colusa Subreach Planning Project Advisory Workgroup
Draft Meeting Summary
August 1, 2005 10:00 AM - 2:00 PM
Colusa City Hall
Colusa, CA

Summary prepared by Carolyn Penny, Facilitator, Common Ground: Center for Cooperative Solutions with assistance from Ellen Gentry, Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum

Present:
AW: Annalena Bronson, Burt Bundy, Ben Carter, Gary Evans, Mike Fehling, Rebecca Fris, John Garner, Francis Hickle, Kelly Moroney, Dan Obermeyer, Jeff Sutton, and Jon Wrysinski
Staff: Beverley Anderson-Abbs (SRCAF), Michelle Baker (Common Ground), Ellen Gentry (SRCAF), Facilitator Carolyn Penny (Common Ground), Project Manager Gregg Werner (TNC)
Guests: Kim Davis, Marc Faye, Tom Smith

Agenda:

Agenda Item	Approximate Start Time	Lead Person	Topic	Outcome
1.	10:00	Carolyn Penny, Facilitator	Welcome, Introductions, June Meeting Summary	• Introductions. Approve agenda. Approve June summary.
2.	10:10	Burt Bundy, All	SRCAF Landowner Assurances Workshop Briefing	• Gain an overview of the Landowner Assurances Workshop results.
3.	10:20	Tom Smith, All	Hydraulic Analysis Methodology	• Gain an overview of the methodology to address AW hydraulic analysis questions.
4.	11:30	Gregg Werner, All	Draft Scope of Work for Hydraulic Analysis	• Discuss and refine, if necessary, the draft scope of work for the AW Hydraulic Analysis.
5.	12:00	Public	Public Comment	• Receive comment.
6.	12:15	All	Lunch and Break	

Agenda Item	Approximate Start Time	Lead Person	Topic	Outcome
7.	12:45	Gregg Werner, All	Draft Scope of Work for Other AW-Identified Studies	• Discuss and refine, if necessary, the draft scopes of work for the other AW-identified studies.
8.	1:30	All	AW-Identified Studies Next Steps and Possible Additional Subgroups	• Determine further process and timeline for development of projects and establish subgroups as needed.
7.	1:40	Gregg Werner, All	AW Workshop	• Discuss possible workshop.
8.	1:50	Carolyn Penny, All	Next Agenda and Next Steps	• Shape next agenda; articulate interim steps.
9.	2:00	Carolyn Penny	Adjourn	

Review of June Meeting Notes

The second paragraph, page 4, third sentence should read: "In contrast, a removal of vegetation (below the bypass) would increase levels within the river channel and decrease bypass flows." With that change, the June meeting summary is final. Carolyn will make this change and Ellen will distribute the final June summary.

Landowner Incentives Workshop

Burt gave a brief review of the Landowner Incentives Workshop held July 28, at the Monday Afternoon Club in Willows. He thanked the SRCAF board members that participated on the landowner panel and for information they contributed on what they were willing to do to help conservation activities on their property. Seven entities also gave presentations on the various types of programs they provide. Packaged programs from several sources added value to various landowner efforts. Les Heringer had talked about M&T Ranch property and habitat they keep simply because they like it. Although he would have liked more landowner presence, Burt thought the landowners in attendance communicated the message that there need to be ways to pay the opportunity costs for the farming activities replaced by conservation activities.

While expressing disappointment at the low level of landowner attendance, Ben added there was good information from agencies, good discussion, and value in exchanging information between agencies. He thought the agencies heard what landowners had to contribute, especially that the landowners need compensation for conservation activities and "one-stop shopping" through coordination by agencies.

Marc Faye felt there was a better turnout than those that raised their hands. He commented that the people that needed to hear the landowner message were there.

Kim Davis stated that farmers have a good working relationship with NRCS (one of the agency presenters), yet programs that were discussed didn't have much to do with farming. She added there were a lot of tax dollars at a meeting to talk about programs.

Jeff checked in with Burt about the degree to which landowners received notice of the meeting. Burt noted that about half of the 800 notifications went to landowners. The preference would have been mid-winter for the timing of the meeting; however this workshop was scheduled after planting, before harvest, and mid-afternoon in an air conditioned facility. He hopes to expand the workshop next year.

Hydraulic Analysis Methodology

Tom Smith, Civil Engineer for Ayres Associates, gave a PowerPoint presentation on hydraulic modeling. In particular, he discussed the differences between one-dimensional modeling and two-dimensional modeling. In one-dimensional modeling, flow velocity vectors are perpendicular to prescribed cross sections. If restoration roughness goes up, the average velocity goes down and surface level increases. One-dimensional modeling is not as visual as two-dimensional modeling. In two-dimensional modeling, inputs are a grid and energy is balanced from point to point. This is a more accurate representation of velocity. For example, velocity may go up slightly in some areas, but down in restoration areas, therefore the increase may not be deemed detrimental.

He also showed several film strips depicting the modeled direction and velocity of flow (i.e., River Mile 147). At RM 178, two-dimensional modeling was used. When looking at planting alternatives, it has been previously determined that flow splits do not change more than 5%. Tom stated that the modeling had demonstrated that the river has more capacity today than the Design Flow data, and that 1995 roughnesses are similar to today.

Francis asked about the size of a typical grid of inputs and the source of information for elevations. Tom responded that the typical grid is 500 feet but could be sized smaller to 50 or even 25 feet. Tom noted that the tightened grid results in an increase in the time to complete the model and cost. Elevations are often based on the 1997 Corps of Engineers survey with 2-foot contour maps.

In response to Ben's question about the number of data points for each node on the grid, Tom indicated that the data points for each node are elevation/vertical coordinate, horizontal coordinate, and roughness. He indicated to Burt that figures for roughness are a judgment call and that model results are compared to high water data to confirm accuracy, in the calibration process. Tom stated that he has not done a study with large woody debris as part of the roughness figures.

Gary and Jeff both raised questions about shear stress against the riverbank and the use of velocity and shear stress figures to model erosion. Tom agreed that velocity and shear stress could be used to determine expected erosion. His experience indicates that a velocity of less than 2 feet per second results in no erosion. A velocity of 2 feet per second can move the smallest sediment and an armored streambed requires 7 to 8 feet per second for erosion. Tom guessed that the river has a summertime flow of 2 feet per second just outside Colusa. He

indicated that there is an expensive model ($32,000) that indicates sediment transport and erosion.

Rebecca, Francis, Gregg, and John engaged with Tom on the issue of the merits of one-dimensional or two-dimensional modeling. Tom indicated that one-dimensional modeling would be the better choice if the user wanted a flood analysis, for less money, and in a shorter period of time. The one-dimensional model is less accurate regarding velocity and the impact on flow, for example, of vegetation below the bridge.

Ben asked Tom if he would be able to stake his job on the accuracy of the work. Tom said, "Sure," and added that absolute value depends on the input of data. Jeff and Francis expressed concern that they know of examples with other models where the vegetation made a difference for flow even where the model indicated no difference. Burt indicated that those models are not as complete or complex as the model being discussed by Tom. . He pointed out the importance of "local ground truthing" the model with known flood event elevations to assure accuracy. Dan and Ben underlined that the river is dynamic.

Tom expressed appreciation to the Colusa group for their questions and concerns. He emphasized the numbers will be true.

Public Comment
There was no public comment

Draft Scopes of Work for Studies
Gregg Werner reviewed the Overview of Scopes of Work which included the following:

A) Hydraulic Analysis of Existing Channel Capacity and Hydraulic Analysis of Restoration Scenarios,
B) Peer Review of Hydraulic Analysis,
C) Colusa Subreach Recreation Plan (Public recreation and access for the entire Subreach and the Ward Tract area master plan),
D) Analysis of Local Fiscal and Economic Effects of Proposed Wildlife Habitat Conservation Projects, and
E) Analysis of Endangered Species Act Limitations and Pest Species Impacts on Agriculture.

A) Hydraulic Analysis of Existing Channel Capacity and Hydraulic Analysis of Restoration Scenarios
B) Peer Review of Hydraulic Analysis

The AW agreed the focus of its discussion on the Hydraulic Analysis Scope of Work was to provide input to the Hydraulic Analysis Subcommittee. Francis suggested that the geographic scope of the analysis needs to go a little beyond the Colusa Bridge. Kelly Moroney suggested incorporating new topographic data in the hydraulic analysis Scope of Work. Jeff requested that the analysis include impacts on erosion points already plotted by Ayres Associates. Francis noted that the model will not indicate where a tree may fall and build up a sandbar. Tom agreed that a good geomorphologist could help with that analysis.

When asked who the group would like to go with peer review, Jon Wrysinski suggested obtaining brief proposals from those who were interested. The AW indicated comfort with both Fran Borcalli and Joe Countryman. The AW agreed that Gregg would get the Hydraulic Analysis Subcommittee together to make this decision.

C) Colusa Subreach Recreation Plan (Public recreation and access for the entire Subreach and the Ward Tract area master plan)

In regard to recreation planning, the AW selected a subcommittee which includes Pat Kittle, Ray Krause, Jay Dee Garr, Francis Hickle, Mike Fehling or Woody Elliott from State Parks, Armand Gonzales or a local person from Fish & Game, and Joan Phillipe. In terms of the Colusa Park redesign and the Ward Property, Mike was questioned how much will be utilized, how much development, structure, access, intensive uses, etc. He stated there are possible public recreation uses compatible with habitat restoration. The subgroup will move forward on specifics.

D) Analysis of Local Fiscal and Economic Effects of Proposed Wildlife Habitat Conservation Projects

The same firm will do the fiscal and economic analysis and bring back details to this group. Gregg said he will continue to refine and return a relatively final scope of work and a list of consultants at the September meeting. Joan (in prior conversation) and Jeff (at the meeting) indicated they have consultant recommendations for Gregg.

E) Analysis of Endangered Species Act Limitations and Pest Species Impacts on Agriculture

Jon Wrysinski asked if any other similar endangered species and pest species studies have been done. Gregg mentioned Stacy Cepello and Cross Boundaries being done at the Technical Advisory Committee, but not in reference to an area such as Colusa. Burt felt the contractor should work with SRCAF in looking at Project Tracker. Gregg will return to the September meeting with a consultant list and a refined Scope of Work.

The overall timeline is to issue the Requests for Proposals mid-September.

Next Agenda, Next Steps, and Meeting Schedule

The next AW meeting will be held at the Colusa Farm Bureau Thursday, September 8, 10:00-2:00PM. Due to rice harvest, there will not be an October AW meeting. November 7 is being planned as an all day fieldtrip to include a regular meeting and visiting sites.

The September 8 agenda will include:

- Finalized Scopes of Work and Consultant Lists
- Process for AW Involvement with Consultant Selection
- November 7 Workshop/Field Trip
    - Sites

- Logistics

Interim Steps between the August and September meetings are:

- Gregg will pursue copies of the 2004 atlas of erosion points from Ayres Associates. He will bring those copies or update the AW on progress in September.
- The Hydraulic Analysis Subcommittee will meet August 15 at 2 p.m. and will include Ben. Gregg will confirm room location.
- Gregg will contact the Public Recreation Subcommittee members to arrange for a meeting in the next 2-3 weeks.
- AW members with fiscal/economic impacts or ESA limitations consultants will get that information to Gregg by August 8.
- Gregg will develop refined Scopes of Work and consultant lists for fiscal/economic impacts and ESA limitations studies for the September AW meeting.